

**United Charter Service and Machinists Automotive  
Trades District Lodge No. 190 of Northern  
California, International Association of Ma-  
chinists and Aerospace Workers. Case 20-CA-  
26247**

November 10, 1994

**DECISION AND ORDER**

BY MEMBERS STEPHENS, DEVANEY, AND COHEN

On September 13, 1994, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board issued a complaint and notice of hearing alleging that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the National Labor Relations Act by refusing the Union's request to bargain following the Union's certification in Case 20-RC-17001. (Official notice is taken of the "record" in the representation proceeding as defined in the Board's Rules and Regulations, Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g); *Frontier Hotel*, 265 NLRB 343 (1982).) The Respondent filed an answer admitting in part and denying in part the allegations in the complaint, and asserting affirmative defenses.

On October 11, 1994, the General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment and Memorandum in Support, with exhibits attached.<sup>1</sup> On October 13, 1994, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. The Respondent filed a response.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

**Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment**

In its answer the Respondent admits its refusal to bargain, but attacks the validity of the certification on the basis of its objections to the election and the Board's disposition of certain challenged ballots in the representation proceeding.

All representation issues raised by the Respondent were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding. The Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege any special circumstances that would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that the Respondent has not raised any representation issue that is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941). Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

<sup>1</sup> On October 19, 1994, the Union filed a Joinder in Motion for Summary Judgment.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**I. JURISDICTION**

At all material times, the Respondent, a corporation, with an office and place of business in San Francisco, California, has been engaged in the business of providing interstate and intrastate charter bus transportation services for tourists and other individuals.

During the 12-month period ending April 20, 1994, the Respondent, in conducting its business operations, derived gross revenues in excess of \$500,000 and purchased and received at its San Francisco, California facility, goods and/or services valued in excess of \$5000 which originated from points outside the State of California. We find that the Respondent is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6) and (7) of the Act and that the Union is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

**II. ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES**

**A. The Certification**

Following the election held May 19, 1994, the Union was certified on June 23, 1994, as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time mechanics and mechanics' helpers employed by Respondent at its San Francisco, California, facility; excluding all other employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

The Union continues to be the exclusive representative under Section 9(a) of the Act.

**B. Refusal to Bargain**

Since about July 8, 1994, the Union, by letters, has requested the Respondent to bargain, and since about July 12, 1994, the Respondent has refused. We find that this refusal constitutes an unlawful refusal to bargain in violation of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

By refusing on and after July 12, 1994, to bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of employees in the appropriate unit, the Respondent has engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

**REMEDY**

Having found that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order it to cease and desist, to bargain on request with the Union

and, if an understanding is reached, to embody the understanding in a signed agreement.

To ensure that the employees are accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by the law, we shall construe the initial period of the certification as beginning the date the Respondent begins to bargain in good faith with the Union. *Mar-Jac Poultry Co.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), *enfd.* 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), *cert. denied* 379 U.S. 817 (1964); *Burnett Construction Co.*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), *enfd.* 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

### ORDER

The National Labor Relations Board orders that the Respondent, United Charter Service, San Francisco, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

1. Cease and desist from

(a) Refusing to bargain with Machinists Automotive Trades District Lodge No. 190 of Northern California, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers as the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

(a) On request, bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit on terms and conditions of employment, and if an understanding is reached, embody the understanding in a signed agreement:

All full-time and regular part-time mechanics and mechanics' helpers employed by Respondent at its San Francisco, California, facility; excluding all other employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) Post at its facility in San Francisco, California, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>2</sup> Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 20, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent immediately upon receipt and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous

<sup>2</sup>If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director in writing within 20 days from the date of this Order what steps the Respondent has taken to comply.

Dated, Washington, D.C. November 10, 1994

---

James M. Stephens, Member

---

Dennis M. Devaney, Member

---

Charles I. Cohen, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

### APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES  
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated the National Labor Relations Act and has ordered us to post and abide by this notice.

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain with Machinists Automotive Trades District Lodge No. 190 of Northern California, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce you in the exercise of the rights guaranteed you by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, on request, bargain with the Union and put in writing and sign any agreement reached on terms and conditions of employment for our employees in the bargaining unit:

All full-time and regular part-time mechanics and mechanics' helpers employed by us at our San Francisco, California, facility; excluding all other employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

UNITED CHARTER SERVICE